Cureus

Open Access Review Article

DOI: 10.7759/cureus.57238

‘’Myth Busting in Infectious Diseases’’: A Comprehensive Review

Review began 03/15/2024
Review ended 03/21/2024
Published 03/30/2024

© **Copyright** 2024
Almajid et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0., which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Ali Almajid [1], Shatha Almuyidi [2], Shatha Alahmadi [3], Sarah Bohaligah [3], Layal Alfaqih [4], Abdulelah Alotaibi [4], Albatul Almarzooq [5], Asmaa Alsarihi [6], Zaina Alrawi [7], Rahaf Althaqfan [8], Rahma Alamoudi [9], Sultan Albaqami [10], Alaa H. Alali [11]

1. Internal Medicine, King Fahad Specialist Hospital, Dammam, SAU 2. Medicine, Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah, SAU 3. Medicine, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Dammam, SAU 4. Medicine, Taif University, Taif, SAU 5. Medicine, Vision College, Riyadh, SAU 6. Applied Medical Sciences, Taibah University, AlMadinah, SAU 7. Medicine, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, SAU 8. Applied Medical Sciences, King Khalid University, Khamis Mushait, SAU 9. Medicine, Ibn Sina National College for Medical Studies, Jeddah, SAU 10. Internal Medicine, Al Noor Specialist Hospital, Makkah, SAU 11. Infectious Diseases, King Saud Medical City, Riyadh, SAU

Corresponding author: Ali Almajid, almajidali.1418@gmail.com

Abstract

Antibiotics have played a pivotal role in modern medicine, drastically reducing mortality rates associated with bacterial infections. Despite their significant contributions, the emergence of antibiotic resistance has become a formidable challenge, necessitating a re-evaluation of antibiotic use practices. The widespread belief in clinical practice that bactericidal antibiotics are inherently superior to bacteriostatic ones lacks consistent support from evidence in randomized controlled trials (RCTs). With the latest evidence, certain infections have demonstrated equal or even superior efficacy with bacteriostatic agents. Furthermore, within clinical practice, there is a tendency to indiscriminately order urine cultures for febrile patients, even in cases where alternative etiologies might be present. Consequently, upon obtaining a positive urine culture result, patients often receive antimicrobial prescriptions despite the absence of clinical indications warranting such treatment. Furthermore, it is a prevailing notion among physicians that extended durations of antibiotic therapy confer potential benefits and mitigate the emergence of antimicrobial resistance. Contrary to this belief, empirical evidence refutes such assertions. This article aims to address common myths and misconceptions within the field of infectious diseases.

Categories: Public Health, Internal Medicine, Infectious Disease
Keywords: cefazolin, streptococcus pyogenes, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole, urinary tract infections, adverse effects, misconceptions, myths, antibiotic resistance, antibiotics

Introduction And Background

Antibiotics have revolutionized modern medicine, saving countless lives by combating bacterial infections. Several decades ago, managing even minor infections posed a significant challenge and often resulted in fatal outcomes. Despite the substantial progress made since the introduction of antibiotics, bacterial infections have once again become a critical concern, primarily due to the rise of antibiotic resistance [1]. However, alongside their remarkable efficacy, numerous myths and misconceptions have emerged surrounding their use. One example is that the majority of patients are prescribed antibiotics upon hospital discharge for infections, even in cases where there is no clinical necessity; the antibiotic's spectrum of activity is incomplete, or the dosage is inappropriate [2-5].

Despite decades of experience, the clinical optimization of antibiotics continues to be a subject of ongoing exploration. A conventional belief in medicine asserts that bactericidal agents are more effective than bacteriostatic ones. Intuitively, it may be assumed that bacteriostatic antibiotics merely halt bacterial growth, while bactericidal agents actively kill or eliminate bacteria. The logical inclination is often to favor the latter, assuming their superior efficacy in eradicating bacterial infections [6]. Considering the abundance of misconceptions within the domain of infectious diseases, the aim of this article is to elucidate the myths surrounding infectious diseases, encompassing various branches within the field in light of current evidence.

Review

Bactericidal versus bacteriostatic

In the medical community, there is a prevalent belief that bactericidal antibiotics exhibit greater potency compared to bacteriostatic counterparts. This assertion is grounded in the understanding that "cidal" agents eradicate bacteria, while "static" agents merely inhibit bacterial growth. As a result, there is a tendency to prioritize the prescription of bactericidal agents based on the perception of their enhanced efficacy in bacterial eradication. Nevertheless, it is essential to recognize that these widely held assumptions regarding the definitions of bacteriostatic and bactericidal may not entirely align with scientific principles [6]. All antibiotics categorized as bacteriostatic are capable of eliminating bacteria in laboratory conditions, albeit

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

at concentrations that exceed their minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) to a greater extent compared to bactericidal agents. Two important definitions need clarification. First, the MIC is the amount of a substance needed to stop visible bacterial growth after 24 hours in specific conditions like temperature and carbon dioxide level. Second, the minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) is the amount of a drug needed to reduce bacterial density by 1,000 times after 24 hours in the same conditions. A bactericidal antibiotic has an MBC-to-MIC ratio of 4 or less, while a bacteriostatic agent has a ratio greater than 4 [6]. In clinical settings, the comparison between bactericidal and bacteriostatic antibiotics has been extensively explored through numerous RCTs across various infections. Surprisingly, these investigations have failed to establish a clinically significant distinction between the two categories. In fact, in certain infections, such as skin and soft tissue infections (SSTIs), in the comparison between 'linezolid/static versus vancomycin/cidal', bacteriostatic agents have demonstrated even greater efficacy than their bactericidal counterparts [7].

A meta-analysis involving 56 RCTs revealed that bactericidal agents are not inherently more effective than bacteriostatic agents [8]. The majority of trials conducted across various infections, such as SSTIs, nosocomial pneumonia, community-acquired pneumonia (CAP), aspiration pneumonia, typhoid fever, complicated intra-abdominal infections, Gram-positive bacteremia, genital chlamydia trachomatis infection, and bacterial vaginosis, showed no significant difference in efficacy between bacteriostatic and bactericidal agents. Out of the seven trials that identified a statistically significant difference in clinical outcomes, six trials indicated that bacteriostatic agents exhibited superior efficacy. These trials specifically involved linezolid/static versus ceftriaxone/cefpodoxime in pneumococcal pneumonia, linezolid/static versus vancomycin in pneumonia and SSTIs. The only trial that favored a bactericidal agent (imipenem) employed a suboptimal dosage of the bacteriostatic agent (tigecycline). Therefore, RCTs do not provide evidence supporting the superiority of bactericidal agents in clinical settings [8]. However, no RCTs were conducted to assess the comparison between 'cidal' and 'static' agents in the context of meningitis or endocarditis. Therefore, the meta-analysis results mentioned earlier may not be applicable to meningitis and endocarditis.

Duration of antibiotics therapy

In the hospital setting, where there is significant demand for antibiotics, shortening the duration of antibiotic therapy emerges as a critical strategy to mitigate unnecessary antibiotic utilization. By reducing hospital stays, mitigating the emergence of antibacterial resistance, minimizing drug-related adverse effects, and preventing superinfections such as fungal and *Clostridium difficile* infections, the practice of administering antibiotics for shorter duration proves pivotal in optimizing patient care and antibiotic stewardship efforts [9,10].

The traditional duration of antibiotic therapy is typically based on the notion that a week consists of seven days, as established by Roman Emperor Constantine the Great almost two thousand years ago [11]. Consequently, many standard antibiotic regimens span from 7 to 14 days. However, relying solely on this ancient definition seems inadequate for guiding contemporary medical practices [11].

Regarding efficacy, lots of studies conducted to prove short-term antibiotic regimens has demonstrated comparable efficacy to their long-term counterparts. Unfortunately, the persistent belief in long treatments became even stronger because of another unfounded idea that prematurely ending such treatments increases resistance [12]. However, resistance is significantly more prone to develop with prolonged antibiotic courses [13,14].

Fortunately, in recent years, more than 120 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have compared the efficacy of shorter versus traditional, longer courses of antibiotic treatment [15]. These studies have found that shorter courses are non-inferior for various conditions such as community-acquired and nosocomial pneumonia, acute exacerbation of chronic bronchitis and sinusitis, complicated urinary and intra-abdominal infections, Gram-negative (GN) bacteremia, acute bacterial skin infections, osteomyelitis, septic arthritis, and even neutropenic fever [16-19]. It's important to note that the shorter treatment regimens studied did not typically adhere to the traditional seven-day week as defined by Constantine. Furthermore, a comprehensive meta-analysis led by Kasparian et al., which compared short-term with long-term durations in acute cholangitis, encompassing 1,313 patients in the analysis, revealed no significant disparities in mortality rates between antibiotic regimens lasting two-three days and those of longer duration [20]. Moreover, recurrence rates and hospitalization duration exhibited no variation across all study cohorts. Consequently, the findings imply that both short- and long-course antibiotic treatments might yield comparable efficacy in managing mortality and recurrence rates associated with acute cholangitis in adult patients. Table *1* presents a summary of meta-analyses of clinical trials examining common infections, comparing short-term versus long-term antibiotic duration.

Condition	Study	Cohort	Duration	Result	Reference
CAP	Meta-analysis of 4 RCTs	Pediatrics	3-5 days vs. 7-10 days	Equally effective	[21]
CAP	Meta-analysis of 21 CTs	Adults	≤ 6 days vs. ≥ 7 days	Equally effective, lower mortality with short-term	[22]
VAP	Meta-analysis of 5 RCTs	Adults	≤ 8 days vs. ≥ 10-15 days	Equally effective	[23]
AECOPD	Bayesian meta-analysis of 22 RCTs	Adults	Super-short: 1-3 days; Short: 4-6 days; Standard: 7-9 days; Long: ≥ 10 days	Equally effective, 4-6 days might be the safest	[24]
GN Bacteraemia (Enterobacterals)	Meta-analysis of IPD involving 3 RCTs	Adults	≤ 7 days vs. > 7 days (7-14)	Equally effective	[25]
Meningitis	Meta-analysis of 6 RCTs	Pediatrics	≤ 7 days vs. 10 days or double the days of equivalent short-term course	Equally effective	[26]

TABLE 1: A summary of meta-analyses of clinical trials comparing short-term versus long-term antibiotic duration in common infections

CAP: Community-acquired pneumonia; RCTs: Randomized-controlled trials; CTs: Clinical trials; VAP: Ventilator-associated pneumonia; AECOPD: Acute exacerbation of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; GN: Gram-negative; IPD: Individual participant data

Oral versus intravenous administration of antimicrobials

IV antibiotics are often recommended for patients admitted to the hospital to rapidly achieve peak concentration, as IV antibiotics have higher bioavailability compared to oral antibiotics. However, prescribing them routinely upon hospital admission isn't warranted. Factors to consider when deciding on the administration route include the oral agent's bioavailability, the patient's ability to swallow or absorb medications orally, illness severity, clinical stability, identified pathogen, and infection site [27]. While oral administration is recognized as a cost-effective method, a notable obstacle arises from the perception that oral medications might not attain comparable therapeutic levels to IV counterparts. However, the expanding accessibility of newer and more efficacious oral agents has enhanced acceptance towards this transition approach [27].

Utilizing oral antibiotics offers several advantages, such as facilitating readiness for discharge, decreasing the likelihood of IV catheter infections and related complications, lowering costs, and reducing workload. In contrast to previous clinical practice, contemporary evidence indicates that certain severe infections, including infective endocarditis, osteomyelitis, and bacteremia arising from urinary tract infection (UTI), exhibit favorable responses to treatment through the transition to a highly bioavailable oral medication [28,29-35]. Additionally, a major clinical trial, the "OVIVA trial," demonstrated that oral therapy was noninferior to IV therapy during the first six weeks, showing comparable rates of treatment success at one year in adults with bone or joint infections [35].

A Cochrane review was conducted to assess the effectiveness of oral versus IV antibiotics in febrile neutropenic patients. It concluded that oral therapy can serve as a suitable alternative to IV antibiotic treatment in patients with cancer and febrile neutropenia (excluding those with acute leukemia) who demonstrate hemodynamic stability, do not have organ failure, and are not affected by pneumonia, central line infection, or severe SSTI [36].

Cefazolin for central nervous system (CNS) infections

Cefazolin is a first-generation cephalosporin antibiotic known for its broad-spectrum antibacterial activity, especially against Streptococcal and Staphylococcal species. Historically, cefazolin, as a first-generation cephalosporin antibiotic, has been pivotal in managing CNS infections due to its effective pharmacokinetics and broad antibacterial activity [37]. However, a common misconception about cefazolin is the belief that it is inappropriate for treating bacterial meningitis. The reported negative outcomes in case series involving patients receiving cephalothin for invasive streptococcal infections suggested that these occurrences were due to poor penetration of cephalothin across the blood-brain barrier. Although there are no documented breakthrough meningitis cases associated with cefazolin, its use as a therapeutic agent for CNS infections has likely been avoided due to its classification alongside other first-generation cephalosporins, such as cephalothin [38].

A case report has indicated that continuous infusion of cefazolin could achieve therapeutic levels and sterilize cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), potentially aiding in bacterial eradication [39]. The report, which involved a patient with methicillin-sensitive *Staphylococcus aureus* (MSSA) ventriculitis, demonstrated that administering at least 8 grams of cefazolin daily via continuous infusion led to CSF sterilization within 48 hours of initiating cefazolin treatment [39].

A retrospective study was conducted to assess the efficacy of cefazolin in treating MSSA-related meningitis by investigating its penetration into the meninges [40]. Among the 17 patients included, 47% received cefazolin treatment, primarily administered via continuous infusion. The median CSF concentration of cefazolin was 2.8 mg/L. The results of this study indicate that cefazolin can attain therapeutic concentrations in CSF, thereby suggesting its potential as a viable treatment option for MSSA meningitis [40]. Furthermore, a prospective pharmacokinetic study was conducted to assess the distribution of cefazolin into the CSF in critically ill adults with neurological injuries. Blood and CSF samples were collected from 15 patients receiving cefazolin intravenously for external ventricular drain (EVD) prophylaxis. The study revealed median CSF concentrations of 2.97 mg/L for peak levels and 1.59 mg/L for trough levels, suggesting viable therapeutic options for meningitis or ventriculitis caused by MSSA. Further investigation through clinical trials is warranted to confirm these findings [41].

Antibiotics adverse effects and contraindications

Doxycycline and Children

Antibiotics are implicated in tooth discoloration across pediatric populations. Historically, tetracycline-class antibiotics have been extensively employed to combat various infections in children [42,43]. During this time frame, clinicians frequently noted the occurrence of yellow pigmentation on the teeth of young patients attending follow-up clinics, an observation that correlates with earlier findings linking skeletal pigmentation in children to tetracycline exposure [44]. Historical concerns regarding tooth discoloration in children under eight years old are associated with older tetracycline-class medications, which exhibit a greater propensity to bind with calcium compared to more contemporary counterparts like doxycycline [45].

In 2013, Todd et al. conducted a blinded study to assess tooth discoloration following the administration of doxycycline to children under eight years old in a community with high rate of Rocky Mountain spotted fever. The study involved 58 children under eight years old who received doxycycline for an average duration of 7.3 days, with an average dosage of 2.3 mg/kg, compared to 213 children who never received doxycycline. The study found no significant differences in tooth discoloration between children who received doxycycline and those who did not [46]. Additionally, the American Academy of Pediatrics Red Book indicates that doxycycline can be safely administered for up to 21 days regardless of age [47].

Linezolid and Serotonin Syndrome

Over the past 15 years, serotonin toxicity, also known as serotonin syndrome, has become a more prevalent and significant clinical concern in the field of medicine. This coincides with the introduction of numerous new antidepressants capable of increasing serotonin (5-HT) levels in the CNS [48]. The oxazolidinones share structural similarities with toloxatone, a recognized inhibitor of monoamine oxidase (MAO) [49]. Linezolid, a synthetic oxazolidinone antibiotic, exhibits mild and reversible inhibition of both MAO-A and MAO-B [50,51]. In humans, MAO exists in two forms: types A and B. These enzymes play a crucial role in metabolizing monoamine neurotransmitters such as epinephrine, norepinephrine, serotonin, and dopamine. MAO-A primarily metabolizes epinephrine, norepinephrine, and serotonin. The simultaneous use of a nonselective MAO inhibitor (e.g., phenelzine) and a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI) is well-documented to induce serotonin syndrome [49,52]. Nevertheless, real-world data from a retrospective study involving 1,743 patients determined that the incidence of serotonin syndrome among individuals administered both linezolid and a serotonergic agent was 0.06%, as assessed by the Sternbach criteria, and recorded as 0% based on the Hunter criteria [53]. Furthermore, in another retrospective study spanning a six-year period and involving 1,134 patients prescribed linezolid, 215 patients were concurrently taking antidepressants, and the incidence of serotonin syndrome in the entire cohort was less than 0.5% [54].

Nitrofurantoin and Creatinine Clearance

Nitrofurantoin is an antibiotic that is mainly used as a first-line agent in the treatment of uncomplicated cystitis [55]. Nonetheless, is use is limited in patients with creatinine clearance (CrCl) below 60 mL/min. Instances of adverse events associated with nitrofurantoin in patients with renal insufficiency primarily arise from treatments that exceed the recommended 5-day duration advised by the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) [55-57]. The product information for Macrodantin in 1988 specified a CrCl cutoff level of 40 mL/min, whereas the updated contraindication of less than 60 mL/min is stated in the 2003 Macrobid product information. The decision to avoid using nitrofurantoin in patients with a CrCl below 60 mL/min appears to stem from studies conducted in the 1950s and 1960s that investigated the urinary excretion of this drug in patients with varying degrees of kidney function [58]. These studies were criticized for their small sample sizes, lack of statistical rigor, and inconsistent methodologies, including unclear

definitions of CrCl or renal impairment, as well as varied doses and treatment durations. Most data were gathered after a single dose of nitrofurantoin, using outdated formulations with lower bioavailability. However, they failed to establish a clear link between CrCl values and urinary nitrofurantoin concentrations or clinical outcomes. Importantly, they did not measure urinary concentrations but rather reported the quantities of nitrofurantoin in urine samples [58].

In contrast, three retrospective studies have investigated the use of nitrofurantoin in patients with impaired renal function and supported the safety and efficacy of nitrofurantoin in renal impairment. One study from 2009, involving hospitalized Canadian patients, found similar rates of clinical cure between those with CrCl >50 mL/min and those with CrCl ⩽50 mL/min [59]. Adverse events were rare and comparable between the groups. Another study in 2013, focusing on outpatient Danish women, found no significant difference in overall treatment ineffectiveness between nitrofurantoin and trimethoprim (TMP), though adverse reactions were more common with nitrofurantoin, particularly in patients with impaired renal function (median CrCl = 38 mL/min) [60]. Similarly, a retrospective review of Canadian women aged 65 or older found that while a second antibiotic was more frequently prescribed for the nitrofurantoin group in patients with impaired renal function (median CrCl = 38 mL/min), there was no increased risk of treatment failure compared to those with median CrCl of 69 mL/min [61]. Moreover, The 2015 Beers Criteria for Potentially Inappropriate Medication Use in Older Adults provides a revised suggestion regarding the utilization of nitrofurantoin in individuals with compromised kidney function. The revised criteria reduced the renal function threshold to CrCl <30 mL/min [62]. Thus, the contraindication of avoiding nitrofurantoin in patients with a CrCl <60 mL/min may not be warranted.

Urinary tract infections

UTI is a frequently encountered infection; nonetheless, physicians often order urine cultures for patients without clear indications, resulting in the inappropriate prescription of antibiotics [63]. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), hospitals could potentially avoid 40% of the inappropriately prescribed antibiotics [64]. Individuals with asymptomatic bacteriuria (ASB) in the intensive care unit (ICU) and elderly patients experiencing confusion are more likely to receive antimicrobial treatment. However, the use of antibiotics for those with ASB, lacking clear indications, significantly contributes to the development of antibiotic resistance [63]. Factors such as urine color, smell, and the presence of pyuria (or positive leukocyte esterase) or bacteriuria should not be used in isolation for diagnosis [63-66]. Contamination should be suspected if the urine sample contains > 5 squamous epithelial cells, necessitating proper collection procedures [67]. Notably, not all bacteria found in catheter-obtained urine samples should be treated as a UTI; 89% of chronically catheterized patients exhibit bacteriuria [68]. Furthermore, there is no conclusive evidence indicating that patients with ASB will develop UTI or long-term complications like pyelonephritis, sepsis, hypertension, or renal failure in the future [69]. Elderly individuals presenting with confusion and falls do not always have UTI; alternative causes for altered mental status should be considered [69]. Lastly, the presence of candida in urine samples, particularly in catheterized patients, does not necessarily indicate a candida UTI or the need for antimicrobial prescriptions unless patients are at high risk, such as those on immunosuppressants or transplant recipients [70]. Therefore, doctors should integrate clinical symptoms and investigative findings to prevent over-treatment and unnecessary antimicrobial prescriptions.

Sterile pyuria is characterized by a concentration of ten or more white blood cells (WBC) per cubic millimeter in a urine sample. Research has demonstrated that 13.9% of women and 2.6% of men show a positive WBC count in their urine samples. It is crucial to note that not all occurrences of sterile pyuria signify an infection; a range of potential factors can lead to an elevated WBC count in a urine sample. These factors encompass sexually transmitted diseases, genitourinary tuberculosis, fungal infections, and various inflammatory and autoimmune conditions [71-77]. Furthermore, inflammation beyond the urinary tract and various urological conditions, such as pneumonia, urinary stones, radiation cystitis, and polycystic disease, can also present with sterile pyuria [78]. It is imperative to conduct a thorough assessment to identify the precise cause of sterile pyuria, guiding the formulation of an effective management plan. This strategy aids in reducing the improper and erroneous use of antimicrobials, ensuring that the treatment aligns with the underlying condition.

Screening and treating ASB is recommended for pregnant women and individuals undergoing invasive urologic procedures [79]. However, there are strong recommendations against screening and treating healthy women, older individuals, children, men, or those with diabetes, non-renal organ transplants, indwelling catheters, patients with urologic device implantation, or spinal cord injuries. Moreover, patients undergoing non-urological procedures do not need antibiotics for UTI, but they should receive standard antibiotics as prophylaxis 30-60 minutes before surgery [79]. The potential benefits of screening and treating ASB in these groups do not outweigh the associated risks. Additionally, the evidence for screening or treating patients with a post-kidney transplant beyond one month or those who are neutropenic was considered insufficient by the latest IDSA guidelines [79].

The efficacy of trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole against *Streptococcus pyogenes*

Several in vitro studies have highlighted the unreliable activity of trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX) against *Streptococcus pyogenes* (*S. pyogenes*), underscoring instances of resistance to TMP-SMX [80,81]. The findings of these in vitro studies are linked to high thymidine content, which is recognized for inhibiting TMP-SMX activity, in contrast to Mueller Hinton broth, which has low levels of thymidine [82]. This initial encounter led to the perception that TMP-SMX is not effective against *S. pyogenes*, resulting in its discouragement in clinical practice for many years. Furthermore, the latest clinical practice guidelines by the IDSA do not recommend the use of TMP-SMX in the initial empiric management of SSTI for coverage of *S. pyogenes* [83]. In contrast, a recent investigation involving 49 isolates of *S. pyogenes* revealed that all isolates exhibited susceptibility to TMP-SMX when assessed using the gold standard method of broth microdilution (BMD) [84]. Several other in vitro studies have provided supportive data on the activity of TMP-SMX against *S. pyogenes* [85-87]. The majority of clinical trials on TMP-SMX have concentrated on SSTI, where *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*) is the primary pathogen [84,88-94]. Nevertheless, recent trials addressing impetigo and cellulitis unequivocally indicate that TMP-SMX is non-inferior to the standard of care in treating those diseases [95,96]. A trial conducted by Bowen et al. compared short-course oral co-trimoxazole with standard treatment using intramuscular benzathine benzylpenicillin in 508 patients from a pediatric population aged 3 months to 13 years with purulent or crusted non-bullous impetigo. Participants were randomly assigned to receive either benzathine benzylpenicillin or co-trimoxazole. The results demonstrated the non-inferiority of co-trimoxazole compared to benzathine benzylpenicillin in treating non-bullous impetigo, which is commonly caused by *S. aureus* and *S. pyogenes* [95]. In another trial involving 524 patients diagnosed with SSTIs, of which 280 (53.4%) presented with cellulitis, participants were randomly allocated to receive either clindamycin or TMP-SMX for a duration of 10 days. The study revealed no statistically significant variance in clinical cure rates between the clindamycin and TMP-SMX cohorts, irrespective of age or infection type [96].

Antimicrobial resistance

One of the most pivotal advancements in medical treatment has been the introduction of antibiotics, heralded as a potent form of chemotherapy. Sir Alexander Fleming's revelation of penicillin in 1928 marked the beginning of the antibiotic era [97,98]. Initially hailed for their remarkable efficacy in combating harmful bacteria, early optimism suggested that infectious diseases might eventually be eradicated. However, in recent decades, the emergence and proliferation of antibiotic-resistant pathogens, notably multidrug-resistant bacteria, have underscored a critical challenge [99]. This phenomenon highlights a fundamental misunderstanding of the intricate ecological and evolutionary dynamics within microbial ecosystems [99]. It is now evident that microbial communities exhibit extensive metabolic diversity, enabling them to deploy various defense mechanisms against selective pressures from their environment and human interventions such as antibiotics [100].

Combination Therapy Is Always the Best Approach

Utilizing more than one antimicrobial agent to hinder the development of resistance is not beneficial in all cases. This approach originates from early observations that employing multiple antimicrobial agents proved effective in preventing resistance emergence in *M. tuberculosis*. However, applying this strategy to bacteria with moderately complex or complex resistance poses challenges [101]. The prevalence of multidrug resistance in moderately complex bacteria and the emergence of such resistance during therapy in highly complex bacteria suggest that increasing the number of antibiotics may lead to an escalation in resistance. Examples such as cephalosporin selection of vancomycin resistance in *Enterococcus faecium* and fluoroquinolone selection for imipenem resistance in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (*P. aeruginosa*) illustrate instances of co-selection [102,103].

Resistance to Any Antibiotic Can Arise in Any Species

The reality is that resistance patterns vary based on the organism and antibiotic. Certain bacterial species, including *P. aeruginosa*, *Providencia stuartii*, and *S. marcescens*, are notable for their diverse resistance capabilities, indicating specificity to particular organisms. These species possess inherent resistance features, which are further enhanced by their ability to adapt genetically, allowing them to acquire and maintain resistance elements from various sources. Likewise, challenges similar to those posed by *P. aeruginosa*, *Providencia stuartii*, and *S. marcescens* are encountered with *S. haemolyticus* and enterococci among Gram-positive species [104,105]. On the other hand, certain species appear to encounter challenges in developing resistance. Non-faecal streptococci and clostridia have only shown resistance to a restricted range of antibiotics thus far [105]. Antibiotic selectivity. Rapid emergence of resistance to particular antibiotics like streptomycin and rifampicin. Specifically, short-term rifampicin monotherapy in non-tuberculous conditions has not consistently led to resistance [106]. On the opposite spectrum, there exist a handful of antibiotics that seldom encounter resistance. Nitrofurantoin and the polyene antifungal agents serve as prime examples of such cases [105].

Acquired Resistance Arises Solely Following Exposure to an Antibiotic

Contrary to common belief, resistance to an antimicrobial agent can occur even without prior exposure of the resistant organisms to the specific antibiotic in question. For example, an in vitro study conducted after

the introduction of flucytosine revealed that a significant percentage of Candida albicans and Candida glabrata strains were resistant to flucytosine despite never having been exposed to the antibiotic [107]. Likewise, Enterococcus casseliflavus carries an intrinsic resistance to vancomycin [108]. Table *2* summarises the myths addressed in the current review.

Myth	True/Findings in the Study
Bactericidal antibiotics are inherently more effective than bacteriostatic ones	Bactericidal and bacteriostatic antibiotics show comparable efficacy in clinical settings, with some bacteriostatic agents demonstrating even greater efficacy than bactericidal ones
Longer courses of antibiotics are always better for treating infections	Shorter antibiotic courses are as effective as longer ones for various infections, reducing hospital stays, adverse effects, and costs without increasing resistance
Oral antibiotics are less effective than intravenous antibiotics	Oral antibiotics are equally effective as intravenous ones for certain infections, promoting earlier discharge, reducing catheter infections, and lowering costs
Cefazolin is inappropriate for treating bacterial meningitis	Cefazolin may be effective for treating CNS infections caused by MSSA, achieving excellent therapeutic levels in CSF
Doxycycline causes tooth discoloration in children below 8 years of age	Doxycycline does not cause tooth discoloration in children under 8 years old and can be safely administered for up to 21 days regardless of age
Linezolid and serotonin syndrome	Despite structural similarities to serotonergic drugs, linezolid has a low incidence of serotonin syndrome when used concurrently with serotonergic agents
Nitrofurantoin is contraindicated if CrCl is below 60 mL/min	Nitrofurantoin can be used safely in patients with CrCl above 30 mL/min, contrary to previous contraindications
TMP-SMX is ineffective against *Streptococcus pyogenes*	TMP-SMX is effective against *Streptococcus pyogenes*, showing non-inferiority to standard treatments for impetigo and cellulitis
Antibiotic resistance	Antibiotic resistance can occur without prior antibiotic exposure

TABLE 2: Summary of the myths addressed in the present review

CNS: Central nervous system; MSSA: Methicillin-sensitive *Staphylococcus aureus*; CSF: Cerebrospinal fluid; CrCl: Creatinine clearance; TMP-SMX: Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

Conclusions

In conclusion, the examination of myths and misconceptions surrounding antibiotic use reveals critical insights for modern clinical practice. By addressing prevalent misconceptions, we can optimize patient care and stewardship efforts while combating the rising threat of antimicrobial resistance. To begin with, the distinction between bactericidal and bacteriostatic antibiotics lacks significant clinical relevance. Evidence suggests comparable efficacy across various infections, challenging the longstanding preference for bactericidal agents. Additionally, shorter antibiotic courses have emerged as non-inferior alternatives to longer regimens, challenging historical practices and offering potential benefits in mitigating resistance. Furthermore, we have addressed certain misconceptions surrounding specific antibiotics such as the belief that doxycycline should not be used in children under 8 years old, concerns about linezolid and serotonin syndrome, misconceptions regarding the contraindications of nitrofurantoin use when CrCl is below 60 mL/min, and explored the potential of cefazolin to achieve excellent concentrations in CSF, suggesting its potential usefulness in treating CNS infections. In essence, embracing evidence-based practices and dispelling entrenched myths are crucial steps towards optimizing antibiotic use. Safeguarding patient well-being and preserving antibiotic efficacy for future generations necessitate aligning clinical practice with current evidence.

Additional Information

Author Contributions

All authors have reviewed the final version to be published and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Concept and design: Ali Almajid, Alaa H. Alali

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Ali Almajid, Shatha Almuyidi, Shatha Alahmadi, Sarah Bohaligah, Layal Alfaqih, Abdulelah Alotaibi, Albatul Almarzooq, Asmaa Alsarihi, Zaina Alrawi, Rahaf Althaqfan, Rahma Alamoudi , Sultan Albaqami , Alaa H. Alali

Drafting of the manuscript: Ali Almajid, Shatha Almuyidi, Shatha Alahmadi, Sarah Bohaligah, Layal Alfaqih, Abdulelah Alotaibi, Albatul Almarzooq, Asmaa Alsarihi, Zaina Alrawi, Rahaf Althaqfan, Rahma Alamoudi , Sultan Albaqami

Critical review of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Ali Almajid, Shatha Almuyidi, Shatha Alahmadi, Sarah Bohaligah, Layal Alfaqih, Abdulelah Alotaibi, Albatul Almarzooq, Asmaa Alsarihi, Zaina Alrawi, Rahaf Althaqfan, Rahma Alamoudi , Sultan Albaqami , Alaa H. Alali

Supervision: Ali Almajid, Alaa H. Alali

Disclosures

Conflicts of interest: In compliance with the ICMJE uniform disclosure form, all authors declare the following: **Payment/services info:** All authors have declared that no financial support was received from any organization for the submitted work. **Financial relationships:** All authors have declared that they have no financial relationships at present or within the previous three years with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work. **Other relationships:** All authors have declared that there are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

References

1. Spellberg B, Gilbert DN: The future of antibiotics and resistance: a tribute to a career of leadership by John Bartlett. Clin Infect Dis. 2014, 59:S71-5. 10.1093/cid/ciu392
2. Conner M, Harris WH, Bomkamp JP: ADD it up: an evaluation of antibiotic duration at hospital discharge at a community hospital. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2021, 8:ofab399. 10.1093/ofid/ofab399
3. Scarpato SJ, Timko DR, Cluzet VC, Dougherty JP, Nunez JJ, Fishman NO, Hamilton KW: An evaluation of antibiotic prescribing practices upon hospital discharge. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2017, 38:353-5. 10.1017/ice.2016.276
4. Khan FY, Elhiday A, Khudair IF, Yousef H, Omran AH, Alsamman SH, Elhamid M: Evaluation of the use of piperacillin/tazobactam (Tazocin) at Hamad General Hospital, Qatar: are there unjustified prescriptions?. Infect Drug Resist. 2012, 5:17-21. 10.2147/IDR.S27965
5. Vaughn VM, Gandhi TN, Chopra V, et al.: Antibiotic overuse after hospital discharge: a multi-hospital cohort study. Clin Infect Dis. 2021, 73:e4499-506. 10.1093/cid/ciaa1372
6. Pankey GA, Sabath LD: Clinical relevance of bacteriostatic versus bactericidal mechanisms of action in the treatment of Gram-positive bacterial infections. Clin Infect Dis. 2004, 38:864-70. 10.1086/381972
7. Itani KM, Dryden MS, Bhattacharyya H, Kunkel MJ, Baruch AM, Weigelt JA: Efficacy and safety of linezolid versus vancomycin for the treatment of complicated skin and soft-tissue infections proven to be caused by methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. Am J Surg. 2010, 199:804-16. 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2009.08.045
8. Wald-Dickler N, Holtom P, Spellberg B: Busting the myth of "static vs cidal": a systemic literature review . Clin Infect Dis. 2018, 66:1470-4. 10.1093/cid/cix1127
9. Hayashi Y, Paterson DL: Strategies for reduction in duration of antibiotic use in hospitalized patients . Clin Infect Dis. 2011, 52:1232-40. 10.1093/cid/cir063
10. Corey GR, Stryjewski ME, Everts RJ: Short-course therapy for bloodstream infections in immunocompetent adults. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2009, 34:S47-51. 10.1016/s0924-8579(09)70567-9
11. Spellberg B: The new antibiotic mantra-"shorter is better" . JAMA Intern Med. 2016, 176:1254-5. 10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.3646
12. Spellberg B: The maturing antibiotic mantra: "shorter is still better" . J Hosp Med. 2018, 13:361.362. 10.12788/jhm.2904
13. Palin V, Welfare W, Ashcroft DM, van Staa TP: Shorter and longer courses of antibiotics for common infections and the association with reductions of infection-related complications including hospital admissions. Clin Infect Dis. 2021, 73:1805-12. 10.1093/cid/ciab159
14. Gilbert GL: Knowing when to stop antibiotic therapy . Med J Aust. 2015, 202:121-2. 10.5694/mja14.01201
15. Lee RA, Stripling JT, Spellberg B, Centor RM: Short-course antibiotics for common infections: what do we know and where do we go from here?. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2023, 29:150-9. 10.1016/j.cmi.2022.08.024
16. Ishikawa K, Masaki T, Kawai F, et al.: Systematic review of the short-term versus long-term duration of antibiotic management for neutropenic fever in patients with cancer. Cancers. 2023, 15:1611. 10.3390/cancers15051611
17. Wald-Dickler N, Spellberg B: Short-course antibiotic therapy-replacing constantine units with "shorter is better". Clin Infect Dis. 2019, 69:1476-9. 10.1093/cid/ciy1134
18. Lyons NB, Cohen BL, O'Neil CF Jr, Ramsey WA, Proctor KG, Namias N, Meizoso JP: Short versus long antibiotic duration for necrotizing soft tissue infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Surg Infect (Larchmt). 2023, 24:425-32. 10.1089/sur.2023.037
19. Gariani K, Pham TT, Kressmann B, et al.: Three weeks versus six weeks of antibiotic therapy for diabetic foot osteomyelitis: a prospective, randomized, noninferiority pilot trial. Clin Infect Dis. 2021, 73:e1539-45. 10.1093/cid/ciaa1758
20. Kasparian K, Christou CD, Petidis K, Doumas M, Giouleme O: Short vs long-course antibiotic therapy in adults with acute cholangitis: A systematic review, meta-analysis, and evidence quality assessment. World J Gastroenterol. 2023, 29:3027-39. 10.3748/wjg.v29.i19.3027
21. Kuitunen I, Jääskeläinen J, Korppi M, Renko M: Antibiotic treatment duration for community-acquired pneumonia in outpatient children in high-income countries-a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis. 2023, 76:e1123-8. 10.1093/cid/ciac374
22. Tansarli GS, Mylonakis E: Systematic review and meta-analysis of the efficacy of short-course antibiotic treatments for community-acquired pneumonia in adults. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2018,

62:10.1128/AAC.00635-18
23. Daghmouri MA, Dudoignon E, Chaouch MA, et al.: Comparison of a short versus long-course antibiotic therapy for ventilator-associated pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. EClinicalMedicine. 2023, 58:101880. 10.1016/j.eclinm.2023.101880
24. Yu H, Lei T, Su X, Zhang L, Feng Z, Chen X, Liu J: A systematic review and Bayesian meta-analysis of the antibiotic treatment courses in AECOPD. Front Pharmacol. 2023, 14:1024807. 10.3389/fphar.2023.1024807
25. Turjeman A, von Dach E, Molina J, et al.: Duration of antibiotic treatment for Gram-negative bacteremia-systematic review and individual participant data (IPD) meta-analysis. eClinicalMedicine. 2023, 55:101750. 10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101750
26. Sudo RY, Câmara MC, Kieling SV, Marques IR, Mesquita Y, Piepenbrink BE, Mari PC: Shorter versus longer duration of antibiotic treatment in children with bacterial meningitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Pediatr. 2024, 183:61-71. 10.1007/s00431-023-05275-8
27. Cyriac JM, James E: Switch over from intravenous to oral therapy: a concise overview . J Pharmacol Pharmacother. 2014, 5:83-7. 10.4103/0976-500X.130042
28. Sendi P, Lora-Tamayo J, Cortes-Penfield NW, Uçkay I: Early switch from intravenous to oral antibiotic treatment in bone and joint infections. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2023, 29:1133-8. 10.1016/j.cmi.2023.05.008
29. Sutton JD, Stevens VW, Chang NN, Khader K, Timbrook TT, Spivak ES: Oral β-Lactam antibiotics vs fluoroquinolones or trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole for definitive treatment of enterobacterales bacteremia from a urine source. JAMA Netw Open. 2020, 3:e2020166. 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.20166
30. Coehlo A, Robineau O, Titecat M, et al.: Fully oral targeted antibiotic therapy for Gram-positive cocci-related periprosthetic joint infections: a real-life before and after study. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2021, 76:3033-6. 10.1093/jac/dkab271
31. Arensman K, Shields M, Beganovic M, Miller JL, LaChance E, Anderson M, Dela-Pena J: Fluoroquinolone versus beta-lactam oral step-down therapy for uncomplicated streptococcal bloodstream infections. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2020, 64:10.1128/AAC.01515-20
32. Spellberg B, Chambers HF, Musher DM, Walsh TL, Bayer AS: Evaluation of a paradigm shift from intravenous antibiotics to oral step-down therapy for the treatment of infective endocarditis: a narrative review. JAMA Intern Med. 2020, 180:769-77. 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.0555
33. Maurer SM, Hepp ZS, McCallin S, et al.: Short and oral antimicrobial therapy for diabetic foot infection: a narrative review of current knowledge. J Bone Jt Infect. 2022, 7:61-70. 10.5194/jbji-7-61-2022
34. Mertz D, Koller M, Haller P, et al.: Outcomes of early switching from intravenous to oral antibiotics on medical wards. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2009, 64:188-99. 10.1093/jac/dkp131
35. Li HK, Rombach I, Zambellas R, et al.: Oral versus intravenous antibiotics for bone and joint infection. N Engl J Med. 2019, 380:425-36. 10.1056/NEJMoa1710926
36. Vidal L, Ben Dor I, Paul M, Eliakim-Raz N, Pokroy E, Soares-Weiser K, Leibovici L: Oral versus intravenous antibiotic treatment for febrile neutropenia in cancer patients. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013, 2013:CD003992. 10.1002/14651858.CD003992.pub3
37. Antosz K, Battle S, Chang J, Scheetz MH, Al-Hasan M, Bookstaver PB: Cefazolin in the treatment of central nervous system infections: a narrative review and recommendation. Pharmacotherapy. 2023, 43:85-95. 10.1002/phar.2750
38. Mangi RJ, Kundargi RS, Quintiliani R, Andriole VT: Development of meningitis during cephalothin therapy . Ann Intern Med. 1973, 78:347-51. 10.7326/0003-4819-78-3-347
39. Grégoire M, Gaborit B, Deschanvres C, et al.: High-dosage cefazolin achieves sufficient cerebrospinal diffusion to treat an external ventricular drainage-related Staphylococcus aureus ventriculitis. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2019, 63:e01844-18. 10.1128/AAC.01844-18
40. Le Turnier P, Gregoire M, Deslandes G, et al.: Should we reconsider cefazolin for treating staphylococcal meningitis? A retrospective analysis of cefazolin and cloxacillin cerebrospinal fluid levels in patients treated for staphylococcal meningitis. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2020, 26:1415.e1-4. 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.04.046
41. Novak AR, Krsak M, Kiser TH, Neumann RT, Cava Prado L, Molina KC, Mueller SW: Pharmacokinetic evaluation of cefazolin in the cerebrospinal fluid of critically ill patients. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2022, 9:ofab649. 10.1093/ofid/ofab649
42. Swallow JN, De Haller J, Young WF: Side-effects to antibiotics in cystic fibrosis: dental changes in relation to antibiotic administration. Arch Dis Child. 1967, 42:311-18. 10.1136/adc.42.223.311
43. Conchie JM, Munroe JD, Anderson DO: The incidence of staining of permanent teeth by the tetracyclines . Can Med Assoc J. 1970, 103:351-6.
44. Wallman IS, Hilton HB: Teeth pigmented by tetracycline. Lancet. 1962, 1:827-9. 10.1016/s0140-6736(62)91840-8
45. Biggs HM, Behravesh CB, Bradley KK, et al.: Diagnosis and management of tickborne rickettsial diseases: Rocky Mountain spotted fever and other spotted fever group rickettsioses, ehrlichioses, and anaplasmosis - United States. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2016, 65:1-44. 10.15585/mmwr.rr6502a1
46. Todd SR, Dahlgren FS, Traeger MS, et al.: No visible dental staining in children treated with doxycycline for suspected Rocky Mountain spotted fever. J Pediatr. 2015, 166:1246-51. 10.1016/j.jpeds.2015.02.015
47. American Academy of Pediatrics: Red Book: 2018-2021 Report of the Committee on Infectious Diseases. Red Book. Kimberlin DW, Brady MT, Jackson MA, Long SS (ed): American Academy of Pediatrics, Elk Grove Village, USA; 2018. https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.5555/20183376718.
48. Isbister GK, Buckley NA: The pathophysiology of serotonin toxicity in animals and humans: implications for diagnosis and treatment. Clin Neuropharmacol. 2005, 28:205-14. 10.1097/01.wnf.0000177642.89888.85
49. Yamada M, Yasuhara H: Clinical pharmacology of MAO inhibitors: safety and future. Neurotoxicology. 2004, 25:215-21. 10.1016/S0161-813X(03)00097-4
50. Diekema DI, Jones RN: Oxazolidinones: a review. Drugs. 2000, 59:7-16. 10.2165/00003495-200059010-00002
51. Lawrence KR, Adra M, Gillman PK: Serotonin toxicity associated with the use of linezolid: a review of postmarketing data. Clin Infect Dis. 2006, 42:1578-83. 10.1086/503839
52. Scotton WJ, Hill LJ, Williams AC, Barnes NM: Serotonin syndrome: pathophysiology, clinical features, management, and potential future directions. Int J Tryptophan Res. 2019, 12:1178646919873925.

10.1177/1178646919873925
53. Kufel WD, Parsels KA, Blaine BE, Steele JM, Seabury RW, Asiago-Reddy EA: Real-world evaluation of linezolid-associated serotonin toxicity with and without concurrent serotonergic agents. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2023, 62:106843. 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2023.106843
54. Bai AD, McKenna S, Wise H, Loeb M, Gill SS: Association of linezolid with risk of serotonin syndrome in patients receiving antidepressants. JAMA Netw Open. 2022, 5:e2247426. 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.47426
55. Gupta K, Hooton TM, Naber KG, et al.: International clinical practice guidelines for the treatment of acute uncomplicated cystitis and pyelonephritis in women: A 2010 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the European Society for Microbiology and Infectious Diseases. Clin Infect Dis. 2011, 52:e103-20. 10.1093/cid/ciq257
56. Guay DR: An update on the role of nitrofurans in the management of urinary tract infections . Drugs. 2001, 61:353-64. 10.2165/00003495-200161030-00004
57. Tan IL, Polydefkis MJ, Ebenezer GJ, Hauer P, McArthur JC: Peripheral nerve toxic effects of nitrofurantoin . Arch Neurol. 2012, 69:265-8. 10.1001/archneurol.2011.1120
58. Oplinger M, Andrews CO: Nitrofurantoin contraindication in patients with a creatinine clearance below 60 mL/min: looking for the evidence. Ann Pharmacother. 2013, 47:106-11. 10.1345/aph.1R352
59. Bains A, Buna D, Hoag NA: A retrospective review assessing the efficacy and safety of nitrofurantoin in renal impairment. Can Pharmacists J. 2009, 142:248-52. 10.3821/1913-701X-142.5.248
60. Geerts AF, Eppenga WL, Heerdink R, Derijks HJ, Wensing MJ, Egberts TC, De Smet PA: Ineffectiveness and adverse events of nitrofurantoin in women with urinary tract infection and renal impairment in primary care. Eur J Clin Pharmacol. 2013, 69:1701-7. 10.1007/s00228-013-1520-x
61. Singh N, Gandhi S, McArthur E, et al.: Kidney function and the use of nitrofurantoin to treat urinary tract infections in older women. CMAJ. 2015, 187:648-56. 10.1503/cmaj.150067
62. American Geriatrics Society 2015 Beers Criteria Update Expert Panel: American Geriatrics Society 2015 updated Beers Criteria for potentially inappropriate medication use in older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2015, 63:2227-46. 10.1111/jgs.13702
63. Silver SA, Baillie L, Simor AE: Positive urine cultures: a major cause of inappropriate antimicrobial use in hospitals?. Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol. 2009, 20:107-111. 10.1155/2009/702545
64. Fridkin S, Baggs J, Fagan R, et al.: Vital signs: improving antibiotic use among hospitalized patients . MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2014, 63:194-200.
65. Lin E, Bhusal Y, Horwitz D, Shelburne SA 3rd, Trautner BW: Overtreatment of enterococcal bacteriuria. Arch Intern Med. 2012, 172:33-8. 10.1001/archinternmed.2011.565
66. Leis JA, Gold WL, Daneman N, Shojania K, McGeer A: Downstream impact of urine cultures ordered without indication at two acute care teaching hospitals. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2013, 34:1113-14. 10.1086/673151
67. Pappas PG: Laboratory in the diagnosis and management of urinary tract infections . Med Clin North Am. 1991, 75:313-25. 10.1016/s0025-7125(16)30456-4
68. Warren JW, Tenney JH, Hoopes JM, Muncie HL, Anthony WC: A prospective microbiologic study of bacteriuria in patients with chronic indwelling urethral catheters. J Infect Dis. 1982, 146:719-23. 10.1093/infdis/146.6.719
69. Nicolle LE: Asymptomatic bacteriuria in the elderly. Infect Dis Clin North Am. 1997, 11:647-62. 10.1016/s0891-5520(05)70378-0
70. Kauffman CA, Vazquez JA, Sobel JD, et al.: Prospective multicenter surveillance study of funguria in hospitalized patients. The National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) Mycoses Study Group. Clin Infect Dis. 2000, 30:14-18. 10.1086/313583
71. Chattopadhyay B, Hall I: Gonorrhoea presenting as "sterile" pyuria. Br Med J. 1980, 281:841-2. 10.1136/bmj.281.6244.841
72. Rahman MS, Beever W, Skov S, Boffa J: Using urinary leucocyte esterase tests as an indicator of infection with gonorrhoea or chlamydia in asymptomatic males in a primary health care setting. Int J STD AIDS. 2014, 25:138-44. 10.1177/0956462413495670
73. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Recommendations for the laboratory-based detection of Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae--2014. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2014, 63:1-19.
74. Chen PH, Hsueh HF, Hong CZ: Herpes zoster-associated voiding dysfunction: a retrospective study and literature review. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2002, 83:1624-8. 10.1053/apmr.2002.34602
75. Hemal AK, Gupta NP, Rajeev TP, Kumar R, Dar L, Seth P: Polymerase chain reaction in clinically suspected genitourinary tuberculosis: comparison with intravenous urography, bladder biopsy, and urine acid fast bacilli culture. Urology. 2000, 56:570-4. 10.1016/s0090-4295(00)00668-3
76. Aubron C, Suzuki S, Glassford NJ, Garcia-Alvarez M, Howden BP, Bellomo R: The epidemiology of bacteriuria and candiduria in critically ill patients. Epidemiol Infect. 2015, 143:653-62. 10.1017/S0950268814000934
77. Rahman P, Gladman DD, Ibanez D, Urowitz MB: Significance of isolated hematuria and isolated pyuria in systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus. 2001, 10:418-23. 10.1191/096120301678646164
78. Hooker JB, Mold JW, Kumar S: Sterile pyuria in patients admitted to the hospital with infections outside of the urinary tract. J Am Board Fam Med. 2014, 27:97-103. 10.3122/jabfm.2014.01.130084
79. Nicolle LE, Gupta K, Bradley SF, et al.: Clinical practice guideline for the management of asymptomatic bacteriuria: 2019 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clin Infect Dis. 2019, 68:e83-e110. 10.1093/cid/ciy1121
80. Harper GJ, Cawston WC: The in-vitro determination of the sulphonamide sensitivity of bacteria . J Pathol Bacteriol. 1945, 57:59-66. 10.1002/path.1700570109
81. Wilson AT: Method for testing in vitro resistance of group A hemolytic streptococci to sulfonamides . Proc Soc Exp Biol Med. 1945, 58:130-3. 10.3181/00379727-58-14870
82. Ferone R, Bushby SR, Burchall JJ, Moore WD, Smith D: Identification of Harper-Cawston factor as thymidine phosphorylase and removal from media of substances interfering with susceptibility testing to sulfonamides

and diaminopyrimidines. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 1975, 7:91-8. 10.1128/AAC.7.1.91
83. Stevens DL, Bisno AL, Chambers, HF, et al.: Executive summary: practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of skin and soft tissue infections: 2014 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clin Infect Dis. 2014, 59:147-59. 10.1093/cid/ciu444
84. Cho C, Shields RK, Kline EG, et al.: In vitro activity of clindamycin, doxycycline, and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole against clinical isolates of β-hemolytic Streptococcus spp. via BD Phoenix and broth microdilution. Antimicrob Steward Healthc Epidemiol. 2023, 3:e238. 10.1017/ash.2023.515
85. Bowen AC, Lilliebridge RA, Tong SY, et al.: Is Streptococcus pyogenes resistant or susceptible to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole?. J Clin Microbiol. 2012, 50:4067-72. 10.1128/JCM.02195-12
86. Liebowitz LD, Slabbert M, Huisamen A: National surveillance programme on susceptibility patterns of respiratory pathogens in South Africa: Moxifloxacin compared with eight other antimicrobial agents. J Clin Pathol. 2003, 56:344-7. 10.1136/jcp.56.5.344
87. Yourassowsky E, Vanderlinden MP, Schoutens E: Sensitivity of Streptococcus pyogenes to sulphamethoxazole, trimethoprim, and cotrimoxazole. J Clin Pathol. 1974, 27:897-901. 10.1136/jcp.27.11.897
88. Williams DJ, Cooper WO, Kaltenbach LA, et al.: Comparative effectiveness of antibiotic treatment strategies for pediatric skin and soft-tissue infections. Pediatrics. 2011, 128:e479-87. 10.1542/peds.2010-3681
89. Duong M, Markwell S, Peter J, Barenkamp S: Randomized, controlled trial of antibiotics in the management of community-acquired skin abscesses in the pediatric patient. Ann Emerg Med. 2010, 55:401-7. 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2009.03.014
90. Talan DA, Mower WR, Krishnadasan A, et al.: Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole versus placebo for uncomplicated skin abscess. N Engl J Med. 2016, 374:823-32. 10.1056/NEJMoa1507476
91. Holmes L, Ma C, Qiao H, et al.: Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole therapy reduces failure and recurrence in methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus skin abscesses after surgical drainage. J Pediatr. 2016, 169:128-34.e1. 10.1016/j.jpeds.2015.10.044
92. Cadena J, Nair S, Henao-Martinez AF, Jorgensen JH, Patterson JE, Sreeramoju PV: Dose of trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole to treat skin and skin structure infections caused by methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2011, 55:5430-2. 10.1128/AAC.00706-11
93. Schmitz GR, Bruner D, Pitotti R, et al.: Randomized controlled trial of trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole for uncomplicated skin abscesses in patients at risk for community-associated methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infection. Ann Emerg Med. 2010, 56:283-7. 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2010.03.002
94. Daum RS, Miller LG, Immergluck L, et al.: A placebo-controlled trial of antibiotics for smaller skin abscesses . N Engl J Med. 2017, 376:2545-55. 10.1056/NEJMoa1607033
95. Bowen AC, Tong SYC, Andrews RM, et al.: Short-course oral co-trimoxazole versus intramuscular benzathine benzylpenicillin for impetigo in a highly endemic region: an open-label, randomised, controlled, non-inferiority trial. Lancet. 2014, 384:2132-40. 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60841-2
96. Miller LG, Daum RS, Creech CB, et al.: Clindamycin versus trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole for uncomplicated skin infections. N Engl J Med. 2015, 372:1093-103. 10.1056/NEJMoa1403789
97. Piddock LJV: The crisis of no new antibiotics-what is the way forward? . Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2012, 12:249-53. 10.1016/s1473-3099(11)70316-4
98. Sengupta S, Chattopadhyay MK, Grossart HP: The multifaceted roles of antibiotics and antibiotic resistance in nature. Front Microbiol. 2013, 4:47. 10.3389/fmicb.2013.00047
99. Aminov RI: The role of antibiotics and antibiotic resistance in nature . Environ Microbiol. 2009, 11:2970-88. 10.1111/j.1462-2920.2009.01972.x
100. Rossolini GM, Arena F, Pecile P, Pollini S: Update on the antibiotic resistance crisis . Curr Opin Pharmacol. 2014, 18:56-60. 10.1016/j.coph.2014.09.006
101. Rice LB: The Maxwell Finland Lecture: for the duration-rational antibiotic administration in an era of antimicrobial resistance and clostridium difficile. Clin Infect Dis. 2008, 46:491-6. 10.1086/526535
102. Donskey CJ, Hanrahan JA, Hutton RA, Rice LB: Effect of parenteral antibiotic administration on the establishment of colonization with vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium in the mouse gastrointestinal tract. J Infect Dis. 2000, 181:1830-3. 10.1086/315428
103. Michéa-Hamzehpour M, Auckenthaler R, Regamey P, Pechère JC: Resistance occurring after fluoroquinolone therapy of experimental Pseudomonas aeruginosa peritonitis. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 1987, 31:1803-8. 10.1128/AAC.31.11.1803
104. Hamilton-Miller JM, Iliffe A: Antimicrobial resistance in coagulase-negative staphylococci . J Med Microbiol. 1985, 19:217-26. 10.1099/00222615-19-2-217
105. Hamilton-Miller JM: The emergence of antibiotic resistance: myths and facts in clinical practice . Intensive Care Med. 1990, 16:S206-11. 10.1007/BF01709702
106. Goldstein BP: Resistance to rifampicin: a review. J Antibiot (Tokyo). 2014, 67:625-30. 10.1038/ja.2014.107
107. Hamilton-Miller JMT: A comparative in vitro study of amphotericin b, clotrimazole and 5-fluorocytosine against clinically isolated yeasts. Med Mycol. 1972, 10:276-83. 10.1080/00362177285190521
108. Gold HS: Vancomycin-resistant enterococci: mechanisms and clinical observations . Clin Infect Dis. 2001, 33:210-19. 10.1086/321815